ward State-wide Prohibition should think carefully before he finally makes up his mind to support that measure. Let us stop for a moment and count the cost—and in doing this, what better method can we pursue than to take the experience of other states. Only a few weeks ago the people of Maine, the state which has had State-wide Prohibition longer than any other state in the Union, voted the Democratic party back into power the second time since the Civil War, chiefly becuse its platform was pledged to a re-submission of this question: That the people of the state will declare for local option by an overwhelming majority as soon as the matter comes to a vote, is a foregone conclusion. In Kansas, State-wide Prohibition has been an unending nightmare for years and every governor has grappled with the problem. At different times Kansas has had scores of open saloons insolently flaunting the law, and while now and then a crusade against them drives them into temporary seclusion, everybody knows that the bootlegger and blind tiger ply their illegal traffic in spite of all the efforts that have been made to suppress them. Every unprejudiced Kansan will admit that prohibition has been a failure in that state —for what does prohibition amount to if the sale of liquor runs riot in spite of it?

The new state of Oklahoma adopted State-wide Prohibition when it came into the Union about four years ago. On November 8th, the people of that state will vote upon re-submission—Why? Simply because they have found out the old story that a law cannot be enforced in a commumity where local sentiment is against it. From the Arkansas line to the prairies of Panhandle the new state is infested with dives and blind tigers and boot leggers. In many towns open bars flagrantly abuse a meaningless and powerless law and that the people will revert to the local option system—the only sane and practical method of dealing with the liquor problen, is well nigh a certainty. Down in Tennessee where State-wide Prohibition was enacted only a short time since, the same state of affairs exists. In Memphis, the chief city of the state, dozens of dives and saloons run openly with no pretence of secrecy. The Mayor and Chief of Police say they are powerless to enforce a law which is not backed by local sentiment. Grand jury after grand jury has been convened, composed of leading citizens, and yet no indictments are returned. When the matter was passed up to Governor Patterson he replied that whenever the people of Memphis will back him up he will see what can be done—and there the matter rests. In the meantime, the dive keeper flourishes and Tennessee is in a state of chaos and turmoil which has utterly demoralized it commercially as well as politically and from which it will not recover in years. Seriously, is the game?

Much the same conditions exist in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi and other States which have tried this impossible and impractical idea. We might also prolong this article by dwelling on the experience of Iowa, New York, Nebraska and other states which have long since turned their backs upon it but it would merely be a monotonous recital of the same dismal failure over and over again. From beginning to end the experience of these States shows that a law which does not meet with the approval of a majority of the people in a community cannot be enforced in that community. The impractical dreamer grows enthusiastic over his futile cause and sionless hour of stern reality his dream is shattered—for human nature is the same yesterday, today and forever.

In the light of history would it not be best to let well enough alone? Why blindly insist upon fastening this incubus upon Missouri, which contains the fourth largest city in the Union? If small cities like Portland, Augusta, Wichita, Leavenworth, Oklahoma City and Memphis find the task impossible, and what will be the condition in St. Louis and Kansas City if this measure is enacted into law? Today, 76 of the largest and finest counties in Missouri are dry. The State is prosperous and at peace with itself and the world —so, in the name of calm reason and good sense, why not let well enough alone? Why not push the fight against the saloon without violating the American priciple of local self-government? The advocates of temperance have been winning victory after victory under the local option law. Should they not be content to fight it out along these lines in the future as in the past?

The census figures which have just been made public show that Missouri needs to get down to business as never before if we are to hold our enviable position in tho sisterhood of States. We need to tell the outer world about our matchless resources and limitless opportunities--for to do this means that we will attract thousands of newcomers from other States but it means a substantial increase in the value of every acre of land within our boundaries. That such ends cannot be subserved by voting upon the State a measure which means endless turmoil, agitation and strife for the next twenty years should be apparent to every sensible citizen who views the matter calmly for a moment. And here is the point—to get men to think before they act. If this is done, Statewide Prohibition will be defeated by 100,000 majority—and this result will not be a victory for the saloon as an institution but a victory for common sense and the sacred American principle of local self-government.

* * *

The several communities in Missouri must rise or fall together. What hurts one must eventually redound against the other. The city of St. Louis is not only the fourth city in the Union but is the Missouri farmers greatest market place—and hence, when its thousands of business men and every labor union appeal to the state to protect it against the demoralizing conditions which would follow the adoption of statewide prohibition should not that appeal be heeded as a matter of good business sense as well as common fairness? Think it over.

* * *

There is nothing like looking at a great public question from all standpoints. The brewing and distilling interests of Missouri buy $25,000,000 worth of corn per annum. Destroy this great market and the inexorable law of supply and demand will reduce the price of this great product of the farm.

* * *

Obnoxious as the thought may be you can't get away from the proposition that if the dry people have the right to vote the saloons out all over the state the wet people have the right to vote them in all over the state. The wise advocate of temperance will let well enough alone and not force an obnoxious law upon wet counties and cities against their will lest some day chickens come home to roost.

* * *

"Do unto others as you would be done by." This is the plea, old as the Sermon on the Mount, which the wet counties and the large cities of Missouri are making doctrine, brother.

* * *

Party platforms may not be sacred but every good party man abides by them for they represent the will of the majority—and from the day when Thomas Jefferson penned the immortal Declaration of Independence up to the present hour, majorities as they have expressed themselves in party platforms and legislative halls have formed our governmental policies. Both the Democratic and Republican state platforms are pledged to local option as against Statewide Prohibition.

* * *

When the prohibition amendment was pending before the State legislature it was carefully estimated with those familiar with the fiscal affairs of Missouri that the loss of revenue incident to the abolition of the liquor traffic in this State would necessitate an increase in the State tax levy of about forty-five per cent., and hence the well-known "tax-rider" was attached to the amendment. The prohibition amendment, as is well-known, was rejected by the State Legislature. But the calculations then made by the State officials ane tax experts still hold good today. The Tenth Constitutional Amendment makes no provision whatsoever to meet the deficit which is certain to occur in the event of its adoption, but the expenses of maintaining the State government must be met, and an increase in the State tax levy will follow as certainly as if it were provided in the amendment. The State records are public records, and are open to inspection. The Missouri taxpayer who, before voting for Prohibition, fails to inform himself as to the cost of it will have none but himself to blame.

* * *

The adoption of the Tenth Constitutional Amendment can have but one effect in the dry territory of Missouri. That territory cannot be made more dry than it is. The liquor traffic not be more rigidly excluded from local option counties than it now is. The only possible effect of prohibition in the dry county will be the increase in the State tax levy, which will be felt by every taxpayer in Missouri, whether he resides in a local option county or not.

* * *

It takes about six million dollars a year to run the Missouri State government and support the support the State institutions. That money must come from where. The millions which come from the liquor industry must be replaced. The money must be put in the treasury by somebody. It must come out of somebody's pocket. The taxpayers of Missouri must pay the bill, and the dry voter will have to pay his part. This is simply a plain statement of a self evident fact.

* * *

Statewide Prohibition abrogates the principle of local self-government. It nullifies the right of each county to speak for itself on the liquor question. Are you willing that your county shall be deprived of that right?

ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTICE.

Notice is hereby given that letters of administration upon the estate of Joseph Ingram, deceased, have been granted to the undersigned by the Probate Court of Cape Girardeau county, bearing date the 13th day of August, 1910.

All persons having claims against said estate are required to exhibit them to me for allowance within one year from the date of said letters or they may be precluded from any benefit of such estate; and if said claims be not exhibited within two years from the date of the publication of this notice, they will be forever barred.

MITCHELL MCFADDEN,
Administrator.
45-4tf

County of Cape Girardeau. } ss.

In the Cape Girardeau Court of Common Pleas of Cape Girardeau County, November Term, 1910.

Charles H. Schreiner, plaintiff
against
Amy E. Schreiner, defendant.

The State of Missouri, to the above named defendant, Greeting:—

Now, here this 6th day of September, 1910, in vacation of the Cape Girardeau Court of Common Pleas for Cape Girardeau county, Missouri, before the November, 1910 Term, of said Court, comes plaintiff herein by attorney of record herein, before the Clerk of said Court and on behalf of plaintiff files petition in suit herein, and also affidavit of plaintiff herein, among other matters of action alleging:

That said defendant, Amy E. Schreiner, is a non-resident of the State of Missouri, residing outside of said State of Missouri, and cannot be served in this State in the manner prescribed by the code of procedure of and in the State of Missouri, or in any other manner.

And said Clerk being from said petition and affidavit, duly satisfied, and thereupon duly finding that process herein cannot be served on said defendant in this State in the manner prescribed by the code of procedure of and in the State of Missouri, or in other manner.

It is therefore ordered by said Clerk that said defendant, Amy E. Schriener be notified by publication that plaintiff by petition herein filed, of date September 6th, 1910, has commenced against said defendant an action at law, the immediate object and general nature of which is to obtain a decree of divorce from the bonds of matrimony contracted between plaintiff and defendant on the grounds that defendant was at the time of her marriage to him impotent and afflicted with epilepsy and was subject to epileptic fits and so continued to be until their final separation; that all this was unknown to plaintiff at and prior to said marriage and which information was concealed from him for a purpose; that he secured medical treatment for defendant immediately upon discovering her true condition, to cure her of said impotency and epilepsy, but that said condition was found to be incurable. That therein and thereby defendant did offer to plaintiff such indignities as to render his condition utterly intolerable.

And it is further so ordered that said defendant be and appear in this court on the first day of the next term thereof to be holden at the City of Cape Girardeau, Cape Girardeau county, Missouri, on Monday the 28th day of November, 1910, and then and there answer or plead to said petition, or in default therein said petition will be taken and adjudged as confessed, and judgment by default will be rendered against said defendant.

It is further so ordered that a copy hereof be duly published at least once a week for four consecutive weeks in the Jackson Herald, a newspaper duly printed, published and circulated in said Cape Girardeau county, and duly designated by plaintiff's attorney, and duly approved by said clerk as most likely to give notice to defendant, the last insertion to be at least fifteen days before said next term of said Court.

STATE OF MISSOURI, }
County of Cape Girardeau } ss.

I, Geo. E. Chappell, Clerk of the Cape Girardeau Court of Common Pleas of Cape Girardeau county, Missouri, hereby certify that the foregoing writing is a full true, and complete copy of the original Order of Publication in said cause, as fully as the same remains and appears of record in my office.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereto subscribe my name and official signature and hereto affix the seal of said Court at my office in the City of Cape Girardeau, Cape Girardeau county, Missouri, this 6th day of September, 1910. [SEAL]

GEO. E. CHAPPELL,
Clerk of the Cape Girardeau Court of Common Pleas.

NOTICE OF PRESUMPTION OF DEATH OF JOSEPH INGRAM.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Take notice that I have this day suggested to the Probate Court of Cape Girardeau County, Missouri, the death of Joseph Ingram, who was heretofore a resident of said County and State, out who left this state and has remained away for more than seven consecutive years, or has so concealed or conducted himself within this state that he has not been heard of by the Judge of the Probate Court of said County or any heirs of said absentee within the jurisdiction of said Court for more than seven consecutive years. And I have this day been granted Letters of Administration by said Court on the estate of said Joseph Ingram, who is presumed to be dead. And if it is not shown to the Court within two years from this date that said Joseph Ingram is living, I will, at the end of that time, after paying his proven debts and satisfying the necessary expense of administration, deliver the balance of his estate over to the persons appearing to be entitled thereto according to law.

Dated at Jackson, Missouri, this 13th day of August, 1910.

45-4tf MITCHELL MCFADDEN.

TIME CARD NO. 22

Chester, Perryville & SteGenevieve Railway Company.

Cape Girardeau & Chester Railway Company.

NORTH BOUND DAILY

No 2 Mail and Ex Lv. Jackson 7:50 a.m

EAST BOUND DAILY

No. 1 Mail and Ex Lv Jackson 4:45 p. m

I. M. TIME CARD.

DEPART—Daily.

Train No. 822 due to leave 9:20 a. m.
" " 824 " " 1:30 p. m.

ARRIVE—Daily.

Train No. 827 due..........12:35 p. m.
" " 823 " .... 4:00 p. m.

Train No. 822 connects at Allenville with North-bound train 422.

Train No. 824 connects at Allenville with South-bound train 423.

S. B. ALLISON, Agent